

**TRANSLATION OF REPLY**

(Original Japanese copy attached)

To: Ms. Sonoko Miyazaki, Examiner of Patent Office

1. Identification of the International Application: PCT/JP2004/016574

2. Applicant:

Name: MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.

Address: 1006, Oaza Kadoma, Kadoma-shi, Osaka 571-8501 JAPAN

Country of nationality: JAPAN

Country of residence: JAPAN

3. Agent

Name: (6586) SUMIDA, Yoshihiro

Address: c/o Arco Patent Office, 3rd Fl., Bo-eki Bldg., 123-1, Higashimachi,  
Chuo-ku, Kobe-shi, Hyogo 650-0031 JAPAN

4. Date of Notification: 11.1.2005

**5. Content of the response**

(1) In the written opinion (the first opinion) presented by International Searching Authority, the following document which was cited by the international search report is referred and it is stated that the subject matter claimed in claims 1 - 12 of the present application is obvious over this document.

**W03/005450 (Document 1)**

Applicant has amended the claims to clearly distinguish the present invention from Document 1. We will hereinafter express our opinion on the subject matter claimed in these amended claims.

**(2) Grounds for the amendment**

The subject matter added to claim 1 has been already described in the original claim 6. The amendment made to claims 5 and 7 is deletion of particular wording. Accordingly, the amendment to claims 1, 5, 7 do not include new matters.

The subject matter of claim 13 which has been newly added is supported by the description written in the paragraph [0058] of the original specification.

The subject matter of claim 14 which has been newly added is supported by the description written in the paragraph [0090] of the original specification.

The subject matter of claim 15 which has been newly added is supported by the descriptions written in the paragraphs [0034], [0055] and on line 8 in the paragraph [0090] of the original specification.

Therefore, we are of the opinion that these amendments are not addition of new matters.

**(3) Opinion**

The feature of claim 1 (amended) resides in that "in the matrix material removal step, the matrix material is removed by at least either heating or etching". In contrast with this, Document 1 only mentions "the matrix material is removed" and does not disclose nor suggest the characteristic contexture of claim 1.

Claim 15 (added) is characterized by the fact that "in the matrix material removal step, the matrix material is removed through sublimation or

evaporation by at least any of heating, light and depressurization” in addition to the features of claim 1. This characteristic contexture enables the removal of the matrix material while maintaining the oriented condition of the electronic functional material contained in the mixed material. On the other hand, Document 1 does not disclose nor suggest the characteristic contexture and effect of claim 15 at all.

Claim 7 (amended) is characterized by the fact that “the matrix material contains a heat developable type resist material which is sublimated and developed by heating after exposed to ultraviolet rays or irradiated with an electronic beam” in addition to the features of claim 1. This characteristic contexture enables the removal of the matrix material while maintaining the oriented condition of the electronic functional material contained in the mixed material. On the other hand, Document 1 does not disclose nor suggest the characteristic contexture and effect of claim 7 at all.

Claim 8 is characterized by the fact that “the matrix material contains a photosensitive polyphthalaldehyde base material” in addition to the features of claim 1. On the other hand, Document 1 does not disclose nor suggest the characteristic contexture and effect of claim 8 at all.

Claim 13 (added) is characterized by the fact that “the organic semiconductor compound is selected from the group consisting of pentacene, tetracene, thiophene oligomer derivatives, phenylene derivatives, phthalocyanine compounds, polyacetylene derivatives, polythiophene derivatives and cyanine dye” in addition to the features of claim 1. On the other hand, Document 1 does not disclose nor suggest the characteristic contexture of claim 13 at all.

Claim 14 (added) is characterized by the fact that “in the orientation step, the mixed material is oriented by liquid crystal orientation” in addition to the features of claim 1. On the other hand, Document 1 does not disclose nor suggest the characteristic contexture of claim 14 at all.

Therefore, for the above-noted reasons, we are of the opinion that the subject matter claimed in claims 1 - 15 are not obvious to a person skilled in the art over Document 1.

(4) In view of the foregoing arguments, the subjected matter claimed in the claims of the application as amended appears to involve in inventive steps

and be in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these claims be favorably reconsidered and the case passed to issue.